

## DISTRICT ATTORNEY KINGS COUNTY

350 JAY STREET BROOKLYN, NY 11201-2908 (718) 250-2000 WWW.BROOKLYNDA.ORG

**Iris Santiago**Assistant District Attorney

July 23, 2021

Re:

In connection with the above-named case, the People voluntarily provide the following information regarding:

MOS NAME: ANABELL PEREZ

MOS TAX: 964700

in satisfaction (to the extent applicable) of their constitutional, statutory, and ethical obligations. In addition to any information provided below, disciplinary information regarding this officer may exist online at the following websites: <a href="https://www1.nyc.gov/site/ccrb/policy/MOS-records.page">https://www1.nyc.gov/site/ccrb/policy/MOS-records.page</a>, <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13">https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13">https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13">https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13">https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13">https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a href="https://nypdonline.org/link/13</a>, and <a

## Disclosure # 1:

THE NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION. DATED 04/19/2019. AGAINST MOS PEREZ:

REPORT INCOMPLETE/ INACCURATE - COMPLAINT REPORT

CASE STATUS: CLOSED ON 06/19/2019 ACTION TAKEN: VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS

## Disclosure #2:

THE NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATIONS, DATED 5/20/21, AGAINST MOS PEREZ:

- 1. MISSING DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT ID CARD ACTIVE
- 2. FAIL TO SAFEGUARD DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT ID CARD ACTIVE

ACTION TAKEN: SCHEDULE A COMMAND DISCIPLINE

CASE CLOSED ON 6/5/21

BASED UPON CCRB RECORDS UP TO DATE THROUGH JULY 14, 2021, THE PEOPLE ARE UNAWARE OF ANY PENDING OR SUBSTANTIATED CCRB ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THIS OFFICER. NOR ARE THE PEOPLE AWARE OF ANY REFERENCES BY CCRB TO OTHER MISCONDUCT NOTED, SUCH TERM TYPICALLY REFERRING TO CCRB'S IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL MISCONDUCT BY AN OFFICER WHERE THE NATURE OF THE MISCONDUCT WAS NOT WITHIN CCRB'S JURISDICTIONAL PURVIEW.